



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/855,989	05/15/2001	Edward D. Brill	2206.64630	9366

24978 7590 06/05/2003

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN
300 S WACKER DR
25TH FLOOR
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

PRONE, JASON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3724

DATE MAILED: 06/05/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

On

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/855,989

Applicant(s)

BRILL ET AL.

Examiner

Jason Prone

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 17-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 17-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 May 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 9.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because in Figure 3, item "24" should be replaced with the number "22". A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the plurality of laminations of the stationary piece and the moving piece must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In regards to amended claim 1, the phrase "the moving piece being hingedly secured to the stationary piece, by the stationary piece laminations and the moving

Art Unit: 3724

piece laminations being interlocked" is unclear. The phrase should be re-written for clarity.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-4, 7, and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soultanian (6,163,092) in view of Pfenning. '092 discloses the invention including a stationary piece (10), a moving piece (12) hingedly secured (48) to the stationary piece such that the moving piece does not generate mechanical spring forces (Fig. 2), an electric coil (14), a movement control system connected to the stationary piece and the moving piece (32) having at least one spring (22) and at least one device for adjusting the tension (34), that the coil is on the stationary piece (Fig. 2), a driver (24) crimped to the moving piece (18) for connection to a motor load (26), a hinge holder having a first surface that retains the moving piece axially while still allowing the moving piece to rotate (Fig. 2), a coil bobbin (16) on the stationary piece around which the coil is wound (Fig. 1), that the coil bobbin also has an extension to which the movement control system is connected to (30), that the movement control system is connected to the driver (Fig. 1), and a low friction insert between the stationary and moving pieces where they are hinged (20) but fails to disclose that the stationary piece and the moving piece have a plurality of laminations and a hinge made

Art Unit: 3724

of interlocking laminations of the stationary and moving pieces. Pfenning teaches of a stationary piece (13) and a moving piece (66) that have a plurality of laminations (Fig. 1) and a hinge made of interlocking laminations of the stationary and moving pieces (18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided '092 with a stationary piece and a moving piece with a plurality of laminations and a hinge made of interlocking laminations of the stationary and moving pieces, as taught by Pfenning, to give the motor added strength.

7. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '092 in view of Pfenning as applied to claims 1-4, 7, and 11-13 above, and further in view of WO 00/27599. '092 and Pfenning disclose the invention but fail to disclose a hinge holder having a second surface that biases the moving piece radially while still allowing the moving piece to rotate. WO 00/27599 teaches of a hinge holder having a second surface that biases the moving piece radially while still allowing the moving piece to rotate (22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided '092 in view of Pfenning with a hinge holder having a second surface, as taught by WO 00/27599, to bias the moving piece radially while still allowing the moving piece to rotate.

8. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '092 in view of Pfenning. '092 and Pfenning disclose the invention including that the circular shaped end fits inside the circular shaped opening (Fig. 6) and that the movement control system is located at a second end of the moving piece (Fig. 12) but fail to disclose that the stationary piece has the circular shape at a first end and the

Art Unit: 3724

moving piece forms the circular shaped opening at a first end. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to switched the circular shaped end and the circular shaped opening, since it has been held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Einstein*, 8 USPQ 167.

9. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '092 in view of Pfenning as applied to claims 1-4, 7, and 11-13 above, and further in view of Davis. '092 and Pfenning disclose the invention including that the movement control system includes a screw (34) having threads and a head (Fig. 1) but fail to disclose that the screw being adjustably threaded in an opening in the stationary piece, that the screw passes freely through an opening in the moving piece, that the stationary piece opening is located on one side of the moving piece opening and the screw head is located on the other side of the moving piece opening, a first spring between the stationary and moving pieces, and a second spring between the moving piece and the screw head. Davis teaches a screw (46) being adjustably threaded in an opening in the stationary piece (40), that the screw passes freely through an opening in the moving piece (41), that the stationary piece opening is located on one side of the moving piece opening and the screw head is located on the other side of the moving piece opening (Fig. 2), a first spring between the stationary and moving pieces (50), and a second spring between the moving piece and the screw head (Fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided

Art Unit: 3724

'092 in view of Pfenning with the movement control system characteristics, as taught by Davis, to allow for a more precise adjustment.

10. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '092 in view of Pfenning as applied to claims 1-4, 7, and 11-13 above, and further in view of Huppert, Sr. '092 and Pfenning disclose the invention but fail to disclose at least on grease channel in the hinge. Huppert, Sr. teaches a grease channel (8) in a hinged structure (Abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided '092 in view of Pfenning with a grease channel, as taught by Huppert, Sr., to allow for a smoother hinged surface.

11. Claims 17, 18, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '092 in view of Wahl et al. (5,787,587) and Pfenning. '092 discloses the invention including a stationary piece (10) having a coil (14), that the moving piece is hingedly secured (48) to the stationary piece such that the moving piece does not generate mechanical spring forces (Fig. 2), a driver (24) at another end of the moving piece (Fig. 2), a movement control system connected to the stationary piece and the moving piece (32) having at least one spring (22) and at least one device for adjusting the tension (34), a hinge holder having a first surface that retains the moving piece axially while still allowing the moving piece to rotate (Fig. 2), a coil bobbin (16) on the stationary piece around which the coil is wound (Fig. 1), and that the coil bobbin also has an extension to which the movement control system is connected to (30) but fails to disclose a case having at least one attachment point for securing the motor, a stationary blade, a moving blade adapted for reciprocation across the moving blade, a motor

Art Unit: 3724

secured to the case at the attachment point, that the driver and the moving blade are coupled for movement of the moving blade, that the stationary piece and the moving piece have a plurality of laminations and a hinge made of interlocking laminations of the stationary and moving pieces. '587 teaches a case having at least one attachment point for securing the motor (Fig. 1), a stationary blade (104), a moving blade (122) adapted for reciprocation across the moving blade (A), a motor secured to the case at the attachment point (Fig. 1), and that the driver and the moving blade are coupled for movement of the moving blade (120). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided '092 with hair clipper components, as taught by '587, to allow for use as a hair clipper.

Pfenning teaches of a stationary piece (13) and a moving piece (66) that have a plurality of laminations (Fig. 1) and a hinge made of interlocking laminations of the stationary and moving pieces (18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided '092 with a stationary piece and a moving piece with a plurality of laminations and a hinge made of interlocking laminations of the stationary and moving pieces, as taught by Pfenning, to give the motor added strength.

12. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '092 in view of '587 and Pfenning as applied to claims 17, 18, and 21 above, and further in view of WO 00/27599. '092, '587, and Pfenning disclose the invention but fail to disclose a hinge holder having a second surface that biases the moving piece radially while still allowing the moving piece to rotate. WO 00/27599 teaches a hinge holder

Art Unit: 3724

having a second surface that biases the moving piece radially while still allowing the moving piece to rotate (22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided '092 in view of '587 and Pfenning with a hinge holder having a second surface, as taught by WO 00/27599, to bias the moving piece radially while still allowing the moving piece to rotate.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 and 17-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hanley, Spentzas, Gassner, and Hillebrandt.

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3724

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Prone whose telephone number is 703-605-4287. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00, Mon - (every other) Fri.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan N. Shoap can be reached on 703-308-1082. In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that all formal responses be faxed to 703-872-9302.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-

1148.



JP
May 27, 2003



Allan N. Shoap
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700